

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

GARREN HANDSON,

V.

OVERLAKE HOSPITAL MEDICAL CENTER, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. C15-1772RSL

ORDER RENOTING DEFENDANTS'
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT

This matter comes before the Court on “Plaintiff’s Request for Motion to Extend Motion in Limine Deadline” (Dkt. # 53) and “Plaintiff’s Request for Motion to Extend Discovery” (Dkt. # 54). Having reviewed the requests and the remainder of the record, the Court finds that plaintiff has failed to show good cause to reopen discovery. Nevertheless, plaintiff will be given a brief period of time in which to supplement the evidence offered in opposition to defendants’ motion for summary judgment in order to overcome the evidentiary objections defendants raised in reply. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and, to the extent that he has admissible evidence in support of his claims, his lack of legal acumen should not be the dispositive factor in this case. Plaintiff should be aware that statements made in his declaration that are not based on personal knowledge, reflect out-of-court statements of third parties offered for the truth of the matters

ORDER

1 asserted, or are conclusory are not admissible and will not be considered as evidence.¹ Plaintiff
2 shall, to the extent possible, provide additional evidentiary support in the form of declarations
3 under oath from third parties and/or documents.

4 The Clerk of Court is directed to renote “Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment”
5 (Dkt. # 26) on the Court’s calendar for Friday, March 10, 2017. Plaintiff may, on or before
6 March 9, 2017, file an amended affidavit under penalty of perjury in opposition to defendants’
7 motion for summary judgment. The substance of the affidavit shall remain unchanged, but
8 plaintiff may provide additional citations to (and copies of) new evidence that supports the
9 statements contained in the affidavit.

10 Plaintiff’s request for an extension of the motion in limine deadline is GRANTED. A new
11 deadline will be established if necessary after the motion for summary judgment is resolved.
12

13 Dated this 7th day of February, 2017.

14 Robert S. Lasnik
15

16 Robert S. Lasnik
United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 ¹ Not all of defendants’ objections are well-taken. For example, plaintiff is in a position to state
26 whether and what percentage of the time he was required to exceed certain exertional limits (Dkt. # 52-1
at 9) and that he was told to take a week off (Dkt. # 52-1 at 10).